

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached replacement drawing sheet includes a change to Fig. 2 to show the flow direction through drain pipe 23 according to an exemplary aspect. Such attached replacement drawing sheet replaces the drawing sheet of Fig. 2 originally filed on March 2, 2004.

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the application identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.111 and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

By the above amendments, the specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 21 and 25 have been amended for clarification purposes. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by such amendments.

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 5-26 would be allowable upon withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. See Official Action at page 4.

Concerning the §112 rejection, Applicant respectfully notes that the terms SCOSOx and SCONOx are merely descriptive terms of the function of the recited catalysts, and that one skilled in the art would have recognized that the term SCOSOx refers to a catalyst for the reduction of SOx such as SO₂, and the term SCONOx refers to a catalyst for the reduction of NOx. See, for example, paragraph [0003] of the present specification. As further evidence of the acceptability of such claimed terminology, we note that claims of parent Application No. 09/969,769, now U.S. Patent No. 6,946,419, also recite such terms. Clearly, the Patent Office did not find the recitation of the terms SCOSOx and SCONOx improper in such issued patent. Further, attached for the Examiner's consideration is a copy of International Publication No. WO 01/51178, which shows that the meaning of the term SCONOx is well defined and known in the art. See WO '178 at page 2, lines 8-14.

The remaining rejection of claims 9, 15, 21 and 25 is moot in view of the above amendments to such claims. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, it is apparent that the claims are not indefinite, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Concerning the objection to the drawings, the Examiner has alleged that reference character "22" has been used to designate both a steam inlet in Fig. 1 and a drain pipe in Fig. 2. However, the specification does not contain any reference to reference character "22" as referring to a "steam inlet" or a "drain pipe". Rather, the reference character "22" is consistently referred to as a "purge duct" in the specification. See paragraphs [0014], [0015], [0023] and [0024] of the originally filed disclosure. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that usage of the reference character "22" in the specification is consistent with the figures.

Fig. 2 has been objected to for incorrectly indicating the flow direction of drain pipe 23. As noted above, attached is a replacement drawing sheet of Fig. 2, in which the flow direction through the drain pipe 23 is shown, in accordance with an exemplary aspect.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.


If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general,
the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 6, 2008

By:



Roger H. Lee
Registration No. 46317

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620